

Mr. NEY. Reclaiming my time, I predict we will be back here within 60 days, 60 or 90 days, I will bet that we will be back here, so we will have to work towards the reforms. Also, our subcommittee was the first committee of the House to go down to New Orleans and to Gulfport, Mississippi. We went down with our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS). Some Democrats and Republicans on the staff went down there and they did a fine job. They saw what we saw. This is going to be a long, long process.

I will tell you we will be back here within 90 days again because they can say it will last, but it will not last.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I think, given the calendar, we should do it as quickly as possible.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following letter into the RECORD of the debate on S. 2275, National Flood Insurance Program Enhanced Borrowing Authority.

WASHINGTON, DC,  
February 14, 2006.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker of the House, The Capitol, Washington,  
DC.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Majority Leader, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT AND MAJORITY LEADER BOEHNER: As you know, the President's Fiscal Year 2007 budget requests a \$5.6 billion increase in FEMA's borrowing authority because its flood insurance program, the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), is unable to cover current claims against it from the unprecedented losses resulting from Hurricane Katrina.

Since 1968, the NFIP has offered property owners in coastal and river areas federally subsidized flood insurance. It currently insures approximately 4.7 million homeowners, renters and other policyholders, who pay premiums for coverage. Total insured assets are above \$800 billion with some 20,100 communities participating. In heavy loss years, when losses exceed its premiums, FEMA is authorized to borrow from the U.S. Treasury up to \$1.5 billion. This borrowing has historically been repaid with interest within very short time periods from NFIP premiums and fees.

However, the catastrophic damage and losses resulting from the 2005 Gulf Coast hurricanes is far exceeding the available resources in the National Flood Insurance Fund. Consequently, Congress last year eventually raised FEMA's borrowing authority to \$18.5 billion. But despite this, flood damage claims from the 2005 hurricanes are now estimated to be in excess of \$20 billion and growing, surpassing all combined payments in the program's history. This will again necessitate Congress raising the limit on FEMA's borrowing authority to pay these claims. And, if additional flooding occurs in 2006, these costs will only grow higher.

Unfortunately, this new borrowing will likely never be repaid by the beneficiaries. According to CBO, it "is highly unlikely that the program will be able to repay that amount of borrowing out of its income from premiums and fees." It is estimated that the interest expenses alone from these loans would consume a large portion of the program's annual revenues for the foreseeable future. It would take decades to repay these costs, assuming no other flooding—undoubtedly, these payouts will be forgiven at some point.

Lacking this ability to repay within a reasonable period, we view deficit-financed spending from any additional FEMA borrowing above its current \$18.5 billion level to be essentially identical to those of a conventional federal spending program. Therefore, spending flowing from additional federal borrowing authority should be fully paid for by spending reductions elsewhere in the federal budget.

In addition, any long-term extension must include comprehensive structural reforms to the program. The hurricanes of 2004 and 2005 have made it clear that legislative action is urgently needed to make the NFIP actuarially sound and able to build sufficient cash reserves to cover higher than expected losses. For instance, comprehensive reform would better align premium rates with the policyholder's associated risk while reducing direct subsidies of over \$1.3 billion annually, starting with the elimination of all subsidies for vacation homes, and address the repetitive loss problem, where subsidies flow to homes to be rebuilt over and over after multiple flood losses, while ensuring proper flood mitigation measures and mapping are in place, enforced and used to reduce losses from future floods. We believe these and other reforms are critical to reducing the taxpayers' risk exposure while strengthening and improving the flood insurance program.

This week, Congress is scheduled to extend FEMA's borrowing authority through April. While this spending should be offset, we appreciate your work with House conservatives to ensure this a short-term extension that will allow substantial time for a vigorous and comprehensive reform of the flood insurance program over the coming months. If this imperative reform effort falters, we will oppose any future increases to FEMA's borrowing authority that are not fully offset.

We look forward to working with you and committee leadership to ensure that this component of federal assistance is both timely and fiscally responsible, and that any package of reforms continues to meet core federal responsibilities.

Sincerely,

MIKE PENCE,  
Member of Congress.  
JEB HENSARLING,  
Member of Congress.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2275, to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program NFIP.

The National Flood Insurance Program was developed in 1968 in response to private insurers' unwillingness to issue flood insurance to homeowners residing in areas prone to flooding. The program makes available federally subsidized insurance policies for purchase to communities willing to comply with NFIP standards. Those standards include the adoption of floodplain mapping and building regulations. Currently, over 20,000 communities, supporting 4.7 million people, participate in the program. Statistics show that compliance with NFIP guidelines works—Communities in compliance, suffer 80 percent less property damage than that those not in compliance.

The act before us today will increase FEMA's borrowing authority for administration of the program from \$18.5 billion to \$21.2 billion. Two point seven billion dollars may seem like a lot, but it is a necessary step towards prevention, and prevention should be our ultimate goal. It is important remember that the \$2.7 billion is not a handout—it must be repaid by profits made from premiums and interest accrued from the loan.

Hurricane Katrina opened everyone's eyes to the importance of flood insurance. Flooding is not a problem that just comes around when a hurricane hits, neither is it going to disappear after the damage inflicted on the gulf coast is repaired.

Most are unaware that the United States suffers \$2 billion of damage annually. In fact, in my home district of Houston, from 1978 to 1995, almost \$300 million in flood insurance claims were made. If those facts are not startling enough, consider that the NFIP, the arm of FEMA that makes coverage available to communities in need, is now bankrupt.

Even more alarming is the fact that current evidence indicates that the insurance industry has acted irresponsibly, without compassion, and only in the interest of profits. In 2004, the insurance industry had a record year netting \$800 billion in policy holder premiums. The insurance industry must realize that they have a responsibility to the public, as well as to generate profits for their companies, and that they must find a way for the two to coexist. A staggering 40 percent of property owners along the gulf coast do not have flood insurance coverage. As we have now been reminded in the wake of Katrina, the absence of coverage creates a difficult situation.

The NFIP was created to serve as a safety net to those unable to purchase flood insurance from private companies, and their services are once again in need. The act before us today is an important step in the right direction, but a dramatic change in national policy is the only way we can ensure that the necessary change will take place. I ask my colleagues to rise in support of S. 2275.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2275, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1130

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 2006

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

pass the bill (H.R. 4745) making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for the Small Business Administration's disaster loans program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4745

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for fiscal year 2006:*

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION  
DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Disaster Loans Program Account" for the cost of direct loans authorized by section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, \$712,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is hereby derived by transfer from the amount provided for "Disaster Relief" in Public Law 109-62: *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 4745, provides critical funding to assist victims of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma by making \$712 million in loan subsidy funds available for the Small Business Administration's disaster loans program.

The funding provided in this bill translates into \$4.8 billion in loans that will now be available to victims of the gulf coast hurricanes.

To date, the Small Business Administration has approved more than 60,000 business and home loan applications, awarding \$4.3 billion in loans. Loans continue to be approved at a record pace, yet 160,000 applications remain in the pipeline, and the application period remains open for 3 more weeks.

Without this critical infusion of funds, the Small Business Administration is in danger of depleting its loan funds prior to the Congress considering the administration's next supplemental request for hurricane-related costs.

This bill simply provides a temporary fix by shifting funds previously appropriated for the Federal Emergency Management Agency and redesignating them for the Small Business Administration's disaster loan program.

I also note that the SBA administrator has informed the Appropriations Committee that the need could be much higher than the amount provided

in this bill. However, the committee has used the best available estimates to determine the short-term funding requirements and will continue to review the matter as it considers the next supplemental request submitted by the administration.

This funding is needed immediately as a stopgap measure so that lending to affected homeowners and businesses can continue uninterrupted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California has indicated, the majority is bringing to the floor a bill that transfers \$712 million from FEMA to SBA for Katrina-related costs. We are told that SBA projects they will run out of money by February 21 without the action contained in this bill. That is despite the fact that the Congress has just passed a supplemental appropriation for Katrina that was signed into law on December 30 of 2005.

At that time, Congress actually provided SBA emergency supplemental funding totaling \$441 million. SBA stated that the reason their projections were inadequate was because the size of the loans were much larger than previous disasters, from approximately \$30,000 to \$60,000 per loan.

Even though Katrina and other hurricanes hit in late August, because the SBA was so slow in approving loans, they had no idea of the size. Once the SBA began to approve loans at a quicker pace, they apparently discovered that they would probably be short of funds, but even that, Mr. Speaker, is not the whole story.

SBA believes they will need an additional \$400 to \$600 million on top of what is being provided here to provide funding for all the hurricane victims of Katrina, Rita and Wilma. The difference is expected to be presented during the larger Iraq-Katrina supplemental, which is supposed to be coming any day.

The fact that the administration had no idea that one of the key agencies on the ground in Louisiana was almost out of money seems to me to be just another example of the wholly inadequate response which the Nation has seen in the aftermath of these hurricanes. The administration's initial response was disorganized and indecisive. The people who knew what they were doing, the experienced career employees of FEMA and other first responders, were apparently ignored by incompetent and unqualified political cronies who should never have been in the positions of leadership that they had.

I would have thought that 9/11 would have been a wake-up call. I would have thought that Katrina would be a wake-up call. I think that every Member of this House has the right to be tired of being disappointed by the folks who cannot shoot straight when it comes to providing the needed relief.

Let me also, Mr. Speaker, express my concern about the fact that this Con-

gress is not taking action to address another problem which is an emergency, namely, the energy crisis in this country. Despite some relief being caused by warmer than usual temperatures, the latest figures issued on February 7 by the Department of Energy confirm that the cost of heating one's home has still risen dramatically this winter. Comparing this winter to last, average prices for natural gas are up by 31 percent, average prices for home heating oil are up 25 percent, and average prices for propane are up 18 percent just over that year.

In spite of those price increases, this year's appropriation for the Low Income Heating Assistance Program is actually \$21 million less than last year. A shortfall in LIHEAP is even more serious than these price figures would suggest, Mr. Speaker, because, first, this winter's increase comes on top of price increases over the past several years that far outpace the appropriations this Congress has provided for LIHEAP.

Since the winter of 2001-2002, the average price of home heating oil has more than doubled, the average price of natural gas has gone up 95 percent, and propane is up 68 percent, yet funding for LIHEAP has increased only 20 percent over that period.

So high energy prices were causing a serious problem even before the gulf hurricane disrupted oil and gas production, and that drove prices still higher. The hurricanes simply made an existing problem worse.

I would also point out that these big increases in heating bills mean big increases in the number of people who need our assistance, as well as increases in the amount of aid that they need. The LIHEAP program has been serving only about 16 percent of those who are eligible based on Federal income standards, and I think we ought to be able to do better than that.

I would say that with the number of recipients rising faster than the appropriation, the average grant has been going down. At the very same time, prices are going up. The energy assistance directors estimate nationwide that the average LIHEAP grant shrunk by about 10 percent over the last 4 years.

So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the need for supplemental funding for LIHEAP is apparent. I wish that we could provide it. I wish it were before the House today in a vehicle which would allow an honest discussion of what funding level is needed, in a vehicle that would allow the House to work its will, offer whatever amendments Members think are appropriate so we can approve at a funding level commensurate with national need.

It would seem to me that at the very least we should be providing emergency funding to bring the LIHEAP program up to the authorized level of \$5.1 billion. This is an emergency now, not in April or May, and I wish that this Congress saw fit to deal with this problem.

We obviously have enough time today. I am told that when this debate is over we are going to be rolling these votes or delaying them until about 4:30 or 5 o'clock. That would have been plenty of time to have a spirited, full debate on the issue, give Members the opportunity to offer whatever amendments they needed in order to fulfill our responsibilities to attack national problems. We are not doing that today with respect to that problem. We are meeting a temporary need in SBA, and I am sure Members will want to vote for that, but we ought to be doing a lot more.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), my colleague, who is the chairman of our Subcommittee on Science, State, Justice and Commerce.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time and rise in support of the bill and would say that the subcommittee will be holding hearings to get to the bottom of this.

The funding provided in the bill translates into \$4.8 billion in loans that will now be available to victims of the gulf coast hurricanes. The bill simply provides a temporary fix by shifting funds previously appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency and redesignating them for the Small Business Administration disaster loan program.

The funding is needed immediately as a stopgap measure so that lending to affected homeowners and businesses can continue uninterrupted.

As a personal comment, when we listen to the different debates and comments and all the shows and all the attacking, the things going on in this city, I think it is really time for both parties to come together and to attempt to deal with some of these issues that we have in this country in a less partisan way. There was a very good article that David Broder did in the Washington Post about a week-and-a-half ago when he talked about when President Ronald Reagan was shot outside the Hilton, Tip O'Neill went to his bedside at the George Washington University Hospital and held his hand and prayed with him. There were differences in the country those days, but there was just a different tone.

So I would hope that we could return to the days of Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill whereby the differences were less sharp and more civil to do which, quite frankly, with the problems that this country has both domestically and internationally, come together to do the best thing for the country.

With that, I appreciate the gentleman bringing up this bill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
January 30, 2006.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: You may have missed the David Broder column below that appeared in the Sunday, January 29, Wash-

ington Post on the same day my pastor preached a sermon based on Ephesians 4:29-32 about being kind to one another.

There will always be real differences in our views on issues, but there should not be an absence of kindness and civility in our dealings with one another.

It would be a good idea for the Congress and the country to adopt the Ronald Reagan/"Tip" O'Neill model.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,  
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 1, 2006]

WHEN PARTISAN VENOM DIDN'T RULE

(By David S. Broder)

The stench of partisanship is so strong in Washington these days that it is difficult to remember that it was not always the case that Republicans and Democrats were at each other's throats. But, in truth, there was a time when friendship and simple human compassion were far more powerful than any political differences.

A wonderful reminder of that fact can be found among the oral histories compiled by two dozen of Ronald Reagan's main associates that are being released Sunday by the Miller Center of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia. The transcripts are available at [www.millercenter.org](http://www.millercenter.org).

One of the tapes was furnished by Max Friedersdorf, who ran the White House congressional liaison staff for Reagan. Friedersdorf recounts in the interview what happened while the president was recovering at George Washington University Hospital after the assassination attempt outside the Washington Hilton hotel on March 30, 1981.

Reagan was seriously wounded by John Hinckley, and the day after the shooting, Friedersdorf got a call in the White House from James Baker, Reagan's chief of staff, who was at the hospital. "Get over here," Baker commanded.

"I went over to GW Hospital and went up to the president's room," Friedersdorf said, "and Jim was outside the room with Mrs. Reagan and her Secret Service agent. Baker said, 'I want you to stay here until I tell you to leave.'"

What had happened, Friedersdorf learned, was that Nancy Reagan "was all upset," because Sen. Strom Thurmond had come over to the hospital a few hours earlier and somehow had talked his way through the lobby, up the elevator and into Reagan's room, where he attempted to chat with the gravely wounded president.

"Mrs. Reagan was outraged, distraught," Friedersdorf said. So Baker directed him to take up the watch, and "if any congressman or senator comes around here, make sure the Secret Service doesn't let anybody up, even on this floor."

Friedersdorf said he remained on duty during daylight hours for the next three or four days, and then word came from Baker that the president had recovered enough to start to see people.

The first person to be admitted, Friedersdorf said, was Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill, the speaker of the House.

When the Massachusetts Democrat arrived, Nancy Reagan slipped out of the room and Friedersdorf retreated to a corner of the suite where he could remain unobtrusive. "Tip got down on his knees next to the bed, and said a prayer for the president, and he held his hand and kissed him and they said a prayer together . . . the 23rd Psalm.

"The speaker stayed there quite a while. They never talked too much. I just heard him say the prayer, then I heard him say, 'God bless you, Mr. President, we're all praying for you.'"

"The Speaker was crying. The president still, I think was a little, he was obviously

sedated, but I think he knew it was the speaker because he said, 'I appreciate your coming down, Tip.' He held his hand, sat there by the bed, and held his hand for a long [time]."

When I reached Friedersdorf last week at his retirement home in Florida, I asked him how it happened that Reagan's first guest was the leading Democrat on Capitol Hill. "Well," he said, "Tip was third in line of succession [after the vice president] and the fact he was a Democrat didn't bother anybody. We didn't even think about it. Tip had been calling constantly to see how the president was doing. And there was a bond there.

"I remember," Friedersdorf continued, "the first dinner the Reagans had in the private residence was for Tip and his wife, and my wife and I were there. Tip and the president had a drink or two and started swapping Irish stories.

"Often, after that, Tip would say pretty harsh things about some of our legislative proposals, and the staff would want Reagan to answer him. But they trusted each other, and the president would say, 'That's just Tip,' and let it go."

I asked Friedersdorf if he could imagine that sort of relationship flourishing now between the Republican president and the top Democrats in Congress.

"Absolutely not," he said. Sadly, I think he is right.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. LEWIS, and the Chairman of the Science, Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce Subcommittee, Mr. WOLF, for the expeditious consideration of this legislation. Without passage of this legislation today, the disaster loan program of the Small Business Administration would not be able to offer critical disaster loan assistance to anyone across the nation after February 21. This legislation is also budget neutral—it simply redirects \$712 million previously appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency to the SBA's disaster loan account. This bill does not create any new spending. However, HR 4745 will enable the SBA to support about \$4.8 billion in disaster loans to homeowners, renters, and businesses through May 1 when the next Katrina-related supplemental is expected to be completed.

This legislation is needed because SBA is, in a sense, a victim of its own success. Despite all of the huge hurdles and unfair attacks the SBA has received in recent weeks, the SBA has approved over \$4.3 billion in disaster loans to more than 60,000 residents and business owners in the Gulf States region in five and a half months—despite not being able to get into the region until after the first month after Hurricane Katrina hit the Gulf coast. In comparison, it took the SBA more than 12 months to approve a similar amount of disaster loans to the victims of the Northridge Earthquake in California in 1994.

The SBA disaster loan program offers low-interest loans up to \$200,000 for homeowners and \$1.5 million for small business owners in a disaster area for those items not covered by insurance for the purpose of long-term recovery. Most of the victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita did not have flood insurance because they weren't in a designated flood plain. Thus, the average size of a typical SBA disaster loan has doubled for this event.

Combine this with the fact that this is the largest unprecedented natural disaster ever to

hit the United States, I trust that my colleagues can see why it is very difficult to accurately predict exactly how much should be appropriated for the SBA disaster loan program for an entire year.

I commend the hard work of the SBA and their disaster loan officers, led by Administrator Hector Barreto and Associate Administrator Herb Mitchell, in providing this record amount of assistance to Gulf States victims. I urge my colleagues to support HR 4745 so that these fine public servants can continue their good work not just in the Gulf States region but also for other parts of the United States that may unfortunately be hit by a natural disaster in the coming weeks and months.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as a result of this Administration's failed leadership and mismanagement of resources, H.R. 4745, Hurricane Katrina Small Business Loan Supplemental is a corrective measure. The supplemental funding needed is directly in response to the gross incompetence and poor planning by the Bush Administration. This proposed legislation comes on the heels of Congress providing more than \$400 million for Katrina disaster loans two months ago. This highlights that the Small Business Administration is unable to accurately assess the needs on the ground and funds that have already been allocated have been mismanaged. Running out of disaster loans for Hurricane Katrina victims is an embarrassment to this Administration and a slap in the face to those who survived Hurricane Katrina. The facts are clear; the Bush Administration is failing to help Gulf Coast residents rebuild their homes and their lives.

Immediate assistance must be given to the region's local small businesses. Currently, only 37 percent of Hurricane Katrina disaster loan applications have been approved from a total of 280,000. Furthermore, less than 10 percent of those loans approved have been paid out. As it stands now, there is a backlog of 105,664 pending applications. Congress must take action to ensure that this mismanagement does not continue to compound the devastation of Hurricane Katrina survivors. The Gulf Coast region is depending upon swift deliberate action to revive its economy and put it on the road to full recovery. However, the Bush Administration is steeped in incompetence, mismanagement and cronyism.

Nearly 750,000 families remain displaced from their homes and are paying the price for this Administration's lack of strong leadership. Additionally, this administration has rejected the only bi-partisan plan to rebuild Louisiana. The recent budget proposal indicates misplaced priorities and seeks to slash funding for small businesses, community development and rural development. These funds are precisely what the Gulf Coast requires in order to rebuild. Furthermore, the abuse and the fraud persist in this Administration regarding no-bid contractual agreements which are not capable of rebuilding communities effectively and efficiently in the Gulf Coast.

The Bush Administration has not met the needs of Katrina families, small businesses and communities. To further compound this colossal failure in leadership, the Republicans are refusing low-income energy (LIHEAP) assistance funds today, even though home heating costs are up and federal grants are down. Additionally, 12 states have already run out of energy assistance, and some people may have their heat shut off in the next month. I

must underline that these are poor families that are struggling to make ends-meet. Congress has cut home energy assistance by \$21 million, while the number of people applying for help with their heating bills has reached a 12-year high. Families are essentially paying 17 percent more this year for home heating and 67 percent more since this Administration took office. While millions of Americans are cold at home, oil companies are reporting record profits and Republicans are ensuring that this does not change.

It is clear that Democrats are moving to the beat of a different drum than this Administration. We are committed to putting an end to the corruption, mismanagement and poor leadership that has adversely impacted Hurricane Katrina survivors.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4745, but not without reservations. During the last 5 months the Small Business Administration has issued \$4.12 billion in disaster assistance loans to homeowners and businesses in declared disaster areas, processing 214,000 applications. It has approved approximately \$1 billion in loans to businesses surviving the destructive attacks by hurricanes in 2005.

On the surface it would appear that the SBA is performing well. However, upon closer inspection, reports indicate, that in Louisiana, the roughly 185,000 applications made on behalf of homeowners, a shocking 60,000 were denied. The SBA is distributing a large amount of aid, but that aid is not reaching all of those in serious need. This is evident by the House Minority Small Business Committee's statement that 80% of overall disaster loans have been denied.

I bring these statistics to the forefront of my argument not to completely admonish the agency, but to make the point that if we are to appropriate more funds, they must be better distributed.

The administration's low interest rates on loans are necessary for the reconstruction of the economy in Gulf Coast region, and vital if any sense of stability is to be achieved. The denied applicants often have no other sources of loans, unable to secure the necessary credit.

The interest rates are of particular importance and have increasingly been coming under attack. The Bush administration has announced that as part of its 2007 budget proposal that it would require recipients of loans to pay higher interest rates after five years.

The SBA may be approving loans at an unprecedented rate, but it is failing to sufficiently respond to the situation. The destruction caused by the hurricanes occurred on an enormous scale, which is why more funds should be appropriated to the organization only on the condition that it make better use of those funds. The administration is doing a disservice to potential recipients of aid by denying them the resources that should be made available to them.

In the wake of these wide-scale disasters, we should not be cutting funds, but rather focusing on better and wider-reaching distribution of those funds and the waiving of restrictive regulations that prevent help going to deserving Katrina and Rita survivors to bring relief to those in need. I urge my colleagues to support the appropriation of additional funds to the SBA, but with confidence that in the future the SBA can make the necessary changes to ensure the widest distribution of loans.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today concerned that H.R. 4745, legislation making a supplemental appropriation for the Small Business Administration disaster loan program, is another example of the continued mismanagement of the Gulf Coast recovery effort.

This \$712 million supplemental comes before us today as we discover that the SBA will completely run out of funding for disaster loans sometime in the next week. It is clear that the \$441 million previously appropriated to this program was far from adequate to meet demand for the loans. As a result, the SBA has approved only 37 percent of the 280,000 disaster loan applications the agency has received and is facing a backlog of over 105,000 applications. Of the loans approved, only 10 percent have been actually paid to the homeowners and small businesses that are relying on this critical funding to rebuild their livelihoods in the wake of this unprecedented natural disaster.

How this administration could so grossly underestimate the need for these loans is beyond me. From the very beginning, the response by our Government to this disaster has been wholly inadequate—and this shortfall is just another sad example of the consequences of the poor planning, lack of leadership and incompetence demonstrated in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. Rebuilding the Gulf Coast is going to take a long term commitment of will and resources by the Federal Government. Yet, time and again, this administration has failed to level with Congress and the American people on the full costs needed to support the rebuilding effort.

The needs of the families, small business and communities of the Gulf Coast are too important to be shortchanged by estimation errors or budgetary gimmicks. I hope that any Katrina legislation this Congress may consider in the next few months includes a full accounting of the funding truly needed to meet our commitment to the Gulf Coast.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I was told that I had one other Member who wanted to speak, but she is detained in another meeting. So I think if the gentleman is interested in yielding back the balance of his time, we could do that on this side as well.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I might mention that the gentleman and I, our ranking member, have been working hard to try to bring ourselves together and go down and visit the gulf coast. I think we are going to be able to accomplish that sometime in the near term. It is on both of our agenda, but, in the meantime, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4745.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4745.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 44 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1746

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.

#### MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 341, RESOLUTION OF CONDEMNATION REGARDING IRAN

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 341); that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and pre-arranged to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except (1) 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 79, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 4745, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 79.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 79, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—418

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Bean  
Beauprez  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berry  
Biggert  
Billirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd  
Bradley (NH)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carson  
Carter  
Case  
Castle  
Chabot

Chandler  
Chocola  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis (TN)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Fitzpatrick (PA)  
Flake  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fortenberry  
Fossella

Foxx  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (WI)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hereth  
Higgins  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hostettler  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hyde  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Jindal  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)

Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McMorris  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)

Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Platts  
Poe  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Saxton  
Schakowsky

Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz (PA)  
Schwarz (MI)  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Sodrel  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Abercrombie

NOT VOTING—13

Berman  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Campbell (CA)  
Evans

Hinchey  
Hunter  
Miller, Gary  
Osborne  
Pitts

Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Woolsey

□ 1812

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.